

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 93 14:35:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #87
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 7 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 87

Today's Topics:

 ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
 CW,AM,no-code
 Just waiting the OFs out
 Let each determine their own incentive! (2 msgs)
 No-code issue

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 06 Apr 1993 03:13:01
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!news.uta.edu!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ocitor!
FredGate@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The FCC says "The petitioners recommend that only the station
licensee and the control operator of the station that originates a
communication that violates the rules be held responsible. While we
agree that the originating station licensee and control operator
should be held responsible for violative communications they
originate, we are not convinced that only holding the originating
station licensee responsible would be sufficient to prevent misuse
of message forwarding systems. It appears that the control operator
of the station that first forwards communications from the
originating station on behalf of the system is also in a good
position to determine if those communications violate the rules and
take corrective action where necessary. Therefore, in addition to

holding the originating station licensee and control station operator accountable, we propose to add new Section 97.217 to the rules to also hold the control operator of the first forwarding station accountable for communications transmitted within a message forwarding system."

I am writing an article on this, and the new 97.205(g) on voice repeaters, for the Newsletter of the Texas VHF-FM Society.
(Official address: P.O. Box 461, Jasper, Texas 75951. Membership is \$6 per year.)

Regards, TOM BLACKWELL, N5GAR, PO Box 25403, Dallas, Texas 75225
* Origin: Com Port 1 - DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 02:35:58 GMT
From: usc!wupost!uwm.edu!rpi!cary112.its.rpi.edu!mellob@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW,AM,no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Guys, (Gals), it wasn't my intention to pit CW versus AM.
In fact, it doesn't even matter which is more efficient with respect to what I'm (trying) getting at.

I just want both to be around as long as possible. I was afraid that relinquishing the code requirement would hurt code users

and eventually they would be driven off the band entirely.
I simply used the current situation regarding AM as an example to clarify what I was trying to get at.

If we were to only use the absolute most effective methods of communication, (as determined by Paul's Equations of Mode Efficiency :-)), we wouldn't be a hobby anymore. We'd be lifeless digital bits showing up on a computer screen with no personality.

The purpose of my postings is to get people to think of the consequences of this or that. Not alot of people think long term. My main focus is preserving AM and CW. This is a hobby, we should be able to transmit what we want. Likewise, we should not have to transmit what we don't want. BUT, you fight to preserve your own view, not to destroy your opponents.

-Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu (one of the few OF's who can't
R.P.I. legally drink yet!.)
Troy, New York

Date: Sun, 04 Apr 1993 14:46:02
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!news.uta.edu!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ocitor!
FredGate@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Just waiting the OFs out
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> blood replaces the old, the numbers will
> eventually be there to make
> further licensing changes.
>
> It's all a matter of time.
>
> 73,
> Todd
> N9MWB Started out as a no-coder and proud of
> it.

i think you missed the point todd.. has nothing to do with old or new hams... it
has to do with international regulations..

lee - wa5eha novice->tech->general->advance->extra

* Origin: Com Port 1 DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

Date: 7 Apr 93 17:42:34 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Let each determine their own incentive!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> Funny, one note says the CW bands are dying, another says they're
> teeming. The real question is:
> Since when is it the responsibility of the FCC and its
> licensing structure to ensure effective utilization of our
> spectrum?

Try reading the Communications Act of 1934 sometime. That requirement, among
others, is included in the text. Because of the public nature of radio, the
FCC has stewardship requirements that are quite different from most other
agencies.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny, not victims
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | of fate." -- Ronald Reagan

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 03:40:06 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Let each determine their own incentive!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Funny, one note says the CW bands are dying, another says they're
teeming. The real question is:

Since when is it the responsibility of the FCC and its
licensing structure to ensure effective utilization of our
spectrum?

This is a complete crock. CW is **not** the most efficient mode of radio
communication. It is not the fastest, the most reliable, the most
anything. It is a fine mode of communication and deserves just as much
respect and deference as any other mode of communication. No more and
no less.

Besides, if CW is so great and the phone bands are so crowded, then there
shouldn't need to be any more incentive than that for people to learn
it. I learned it because I wanted to operate Aurora and my multi-mode
controller wouldn't handle the carrier distortion. Why should CW be
singled out and forced upon every amateur that wants access to the low
bands?

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Sun, 04 Apr 1993 14:48:03
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!news.uta.edu!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ocitor!
FredGate@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> debate at the next meeting. If the ITU drops the
> code requirement, do
> you feel the U.S. should maintain it?

i think that if the ITU drops the code requirement, the US license will be

restructured shortly there after ..

lee - wa5eha

* Origin: Com Port 1 DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

Date: 7 Apr 93 03:30:19 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!metro!mippet.ci.com.au!eram!dave@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr1.165240.27241@hemlock.cray.com>,
<1993Apr2.163126.23893@ke4zv.uucp>, <C4zpvM.A9q@athena.cs.uga.edu>
Subject : Re: The exception proves the rule

[Note followups etc]

In article <C4zpvM.A9q@athena.cs.uga.edu>,
mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael Covington) writes:

| For anybody who has ever wondered precisely what was meant by the old
| saying "the exception proves the rule", here's a classic example of it:

[Explanation of how an exemption implied there was a rule in force]

Of course, a lot of people are probably unfamiliar with the older meaning
of the verb "to prove" - it didn't mean "to verify" but "to test" ...

As in: "this is the observation that invalidates the theory, therefore
the theory is wrong." I could never figure out why the popular meaning
seems to be "this is the observation that invalidates the theory,
therefore the theory is true."

My old logic teacher would be spinning in his grave...

--
Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC PGP 2.2
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munari!esi.COM.AU!dave available

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 03:44:18 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <12434@news.duke.edu>, <1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Apr05.080821.2406@ssc.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In article <1993Apr05.080821.2406@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>
>Read it again! It says that you cannot transmit communications
>the PURPOSE of which is to facilitate business.
>
>The purpose of the wife asking the husband to pick up bread is
>not to facilitate the business of the grocer. The purpose is
>to get the bread.

The purpose of getting the bread is to facilitate the business of running the home meal service. Or are you intimating that homemakers are unemployed?

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 03:42:13 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <fritza.733424191@well.sf.ca.us>,
<sumner.733692738@milo.math.sc.carolina.edu>, <11857@prijat.cs.uofs.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In article <11857@prijat.cs.uofs.edu> bill@prijat.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon) writes:

>
>As long as we are going to take such a strict interpretation of the
>rules, wouldn't that mean that all HAMFEST talk-ins are
>illegal?? The sole purpose of the talk-in is to get you there. The
>first thing they do when you get there is take your admission fee.
>The main reason for going is to look for something to buy.
>The violation here seems rather clear to me.

Some ham fleamarket operations have been gigged for using amateur radio for coordination between the organizers. I haven't heard of talk in stations being gigged yet, but I agree that a strict interpretation

of the rules could make some of the traffic there illegal, especially things like announcing prize winners. I think just giving traffic directions is OK. I *really* want to see the FCC relax the content rules so these sorts of things won't be in question.

Gary

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way           | Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244    |                   |
```

Date: 7 Apr 93 17:18:07 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Apr06.153832.73850@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <1993Apr7.141825.15538@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>It's like working DX, some people just want to do things the hard way.

Agreed. I've never understood why people chase DX using SSB, when the same contact using CW requires less than 1/10 the radiated power...

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny, not victims
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | of fate." -- Ronald Reagan

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 14:18:25 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C5119v.5rv@fmsysm.ncoast.org>,
<Apr06.153832.73850@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <paulf.734123152@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Funny thing, obsolescence. AM and SSB have been around for decades, and CW
>is still at least as popular. We've had more than a decade of interaction
>between computing and radio, and yet the CW bands are still well populated.

Yep, takes a loooooonng time for the OFs to die off. :-)

I'm sure we'd still hear spark transmissions if they were allowed.
It's like working DX, some people just want to do things the hard
way. I would note that the traffic nets, feeble as they are today,
are moving in the direction of computers. We used open reel tape
recorders and speech to move traffic quickly back in the 1960s.
That system is still faster than the computer systems of today,
but that's more because of regulations than capability.

I noted with some frustration in the "World Above 50 MHz" column
that computer assisted contacts won't be counted for record status.
Thus the weak signal boys have become as stylized and ossified as
the rest of the CW forever crowd. Weak signal users can no longer
claim they are advancing the art when they refuse to recognize the
greatest improvement in the art available to them.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 7 Apr 93 17:21:33 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr4.054922.6313@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,

<paulf.733965941@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <1993Apr7.140414.15415@ke4zv.uucp>p

Subject : Re: No-code issue

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>At 3 kHz spacing, and ignoring frequency reuse due to propagation, there's
>room for 808 two way QSOs on the present HF phone segments.

You're neglecting propagation in your analysis. E layer absorption and F
layer refraction restrict the number of channels available at any one time.
Moreover, the largest bands (10 and 75/80) are open for the least amount of
time.

> If we opened
> up the CW segments, there'd be room for another 375 QSOs on SSB, a 46%
> increase.

Here, you've omitted the fact that half of those "cw" segments are used for RTTY. Also, the high 50 kHz of the 40m "cw" allocation is useless for SSB, given the broadcasters. Finally, SSB is not allowed on 30m by international agreement.

> I also find this hard to stomach. With stylized contacts, stock CW
> abbreviations can compress the content to near phone levels, but in
> actual conversations that attempt to exchange ideas, CW falls down
> badly. Even with stylized traffic, I was traffic manager for the
> Ky traffic nets in the late 1960s, the phone nets always passed
> much more traffic than the CW nets in their allotted times.
> 120 WPM speech just *is* faster than 13 WPM CW. If you don't have
> much to say, then either is sufficient, but hopefully amateur contacts
> aren't all content free.

Of course it's faster, but that isn't relevant. The question is binary, "is this mode conversational or not?" as far as most ham QSOs go. 13 wpm is pretty much a minimum for conversation, but it is in fact conversational. I'd add that traffic handling is very much a minority activity, which makes the comparison irrelevant on its face.

Let's also not forget that those 450 SSB channels must be shared not only among US hams, but everyone in the world...

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny, not victims
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | of fate." -- Ronald Reagan

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 14:04:14 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <0!d51vn@rpi.edu>, <1993Apr4.054922.6313@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<paulf.733965941@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: No-code issue

In article <paulf.733965941@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> The reason the HF morse requirement should be kept as-is is that it encourages
> the casual, day to day use of CW, instead of or in addition to sideband.
> Unlike the VHF/UHF/SHF spectrum, where we possess hundreds of megahertz of

>spectrum, the amateur HF spectrum is quite limited. There's only enough
>room for about 450 SSB QSOs at any one time; the current arrangement leaves
>enough room for 400 SSB QSOs and about 1250 CW QSOs. During peak hours, the
>SSB allocation, as things stand now, is close to capacity. As such it makes
>a great deal of sense to encourage people to use CW on a regular basis.

At 3 kHz spacing, and ignoring frequency reuse due to propagation, there's
room for 808 two way QSOs on the present HF phone segments. If we opened
up the CW segments, there'd be room for another 375 QSOs on SSB, a 46%
increase. Of course frequency reuse does occur, especially on the lower
HF bands, and on 10 meters when the skip is flat. In actual tuning across
the bands, I find CW signals to be spread much more widely than you indicate,
with less than half as many CW signals in their segments as SSB signals in
their segments. So it seems that in practice CW occupancy of the bands is
much less than theoretical calculations would indicate. In fact they seem
to use about as much of the spectrum per contact as they would if conducted
in SSB.

>At 5 wpm, CW isn't nearly as conversational as SSB; 13 wpm represents a more
>useful level, at which CW becomes about as attractive as talking.

I also find this hard to stomach. With stylized contacts, stock CW
abbreviations can compress the content to near phone levels, but in
actual conversations that attempt to exchange ideas, CW falls down
badly. Even with stylized traffic, I was traffic manager for the
Ky traffic nets in the late 1960s, the phone nets always passed
much more traffic than the CW nets in their allotted times.
120 WPM speech just *is* faster than 13 WPM CW. If you don't have
much to say, then either is sufficient, but hopefully amateur contacts
aren't all content free.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 6 Apr 1993 22:27:21 GMT
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1po3g0INNg0d@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, <1pqah1INNq1c@cronkite.cisco.com>,
<1993Apr6.083328@IASTATE.EDU>p
Subject : Re: CW vs AM

In article <1993Apr6.083328@IASTATE.EDU> wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner) writes:

>

>> There is much more to being a _good_ CW op than just Morse; there are also
>> many, many more "Q" signals than most people commonly know and there is the
>> Phillips code. When you combine these, a good CW op who is running about 35
>> WPM (of clear text) actually has a throughput of well over 100 WPM of
>> information.

>

>OK, I'll bite! What is the "Phillips code"? I don't recall ever hearing
>of it before.

Phillips was developed a long time ago for use by land ops on telegraph lines. It was carried over into radio in the 20's and 30's, but then for some reason, started to fall away after WWII.

Basically put, it is a list of most commonly used words abbreviated down to a commonly-agreed upon shorthand. Nothing hi-tech. The guy who originated it did a decent study of the words and phrases most commonly found in traffic and conversations and shortened them. There were quite the few abbreviations, over 100.

Not too many people use it today (and it's been years since I worked CW traffic nets actively), but every now and again I find someone on the air who remembers or uses it and it really does make for some very nice QSO's since now you're communicating at something close to natural conversational speed and is yet another one of the things that makes the low end of 40 a nice place to carry on a conversation.

I'm not proposing that we all go back to CW traffic nets; I'd be having a hallucination if I thought that even the best of CW ops could carry off traffic as well as AMTOR or packet day in and day out. I'm not trying to be a crank and require 25WPM CW exams before someone gets a HF license. I think that there is so much technical material that would be better served as a test "filter", material that is currently not being addressed even for the extra ticket. (OK, by show of hands, how many people could design a PLL from scratch here? How about a flash A/D converter? ;-)

What I _am_ trying to point out is that CW is a viable communication mode and that most of the people who seem to be licking their chops over the CW portions of the HF bands have a) never really operated CW and b) no real idea that there are some of us who simply prefer CW. Not for spectral reasons, or macho reasons, but simply because we _enjoy_ operating CW. That's it. It really is _that_ simple. For the same reasons that some of us still like single-malt whisky instead of the latest yuppie mouthwash, lever-action rifles instead of a hi-tech Steyr-Aug, cars with in-line 6's instead of turbo 4's, and gold coins instead of credit cards.

After doing hi-tech all day long, sometimes a person wants hobbies that aren't on the bleeding edge of technology. And ham radio is just that: a hobby.

dsa

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 19:44:29 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!convex!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jfhC4tKqo.Gwo@netcom.com>, <1993Apr5.163543.4060@nrtpa038.bnr.ca>, <C52s5F.A8D@cbnewsc.cb.att.com>
Reply-To : tonyp@convex.COM
Subject : Re: motive ...

One of the neat things about amateur radio is the fact that you retain your ananimity (sorry, the dict. is at work) for the most part:

- o The KKK member doesn't know that ham he's working is Black.
- o The anti-semite doesn't know the feller at the other end of the keyboard is Jewish.
- o The chauvinist knows Chris is an engineer, but doesn't know she's a YL.
- o And you just worked WX1ABC, and didn't know he's gay...

And EVERYTHING is fine...

Until one of these groups wants to form a club. Then the "can we get away with persecuting them without reprocushions" kicks in.

Well, when one of these groups DEMANDS I join, then they're messing with my rights. If they want to all get together, and talk in another language instead of English, that's fine. If they want to be "Jewish people only" great - they'll have more in common and probably have a better, stronger radio club. "Brothers on bugs" - fine business, too. "Gay-netters" - no problem.

The whole homo-phobic thing is being propagated by people who have no idea of what "being gay" is all about. It is alot like the Twilight Zone episode, where the aliens play with the electric company, and 50's hysteria takes over (they almost kill a ham radio operator).

You don't get "gay" by talking with one. Or being near one. Or even hugging one. If you're REALLY straight you don't have a problem.

What you really need to do is go to a gaybar on a busy night. I pestered my best friend to take me to one when I visited him. We ran into all sorts of NICE people. And once you tell someone "I'm not interested" they don't try to force you to their way of thinking/feeling. Women should have such a deal when they tell some guy "I'm not interested" and he continues to harass them.

Remember: being gay isn't contagious.

gay people don't reproduce, making more gays.

gay people come from straight parents.

they're out of the closet, and they're not going back in.

BUT one of your kids could come down with it.

Madison Ave. has done surveys, and has found that the average gay person:

- o earns above-average wages
- o lives above-average
- o spends above-average
- o owns their own home

Madison Ave. sees a vast untapped group that's affluent, and likes to spend. As soon as they can figure out how to advertise to them, without alienating their current "bigotted buyers", the ads will be pouring out.

--

Tony J. Podrasky	[YOGI-ism]s: - It's not an illusion: it just looks like one.
San Diego , Ca	- No one goes there anymore: it's too crowded.
tonyp@convex.com	- Hey Yogi: You're looking pretty cool today.
QSL? QRU? QRZ? QLZ?	Thanks: you don't look so hot
yourself.	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #87
